

# FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, March 27, 2003

---

## PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

**Present:** Chairman Kent Forsgren, Bart Hill, Cindy Roybal, Jim Talbot, Jordan White, Sid Young, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman. Commission Member Cory Ritz was excused.

**Chairman Forsgren** began the meeting at 6:30 P.M. Commission members discussed two agenda items.

- ▮ Agenda Item #5 regarding HHI Corporation's request for recommendation to the City Council to have a zoning text amendment to allow a small auto dealership was considered. Mr. Petersen had been asked to research options for special exceptions or for temporary use permits. The City Attorney advised against both those options. Mr. Hokanson was present and talked about signage for the proposed business. Commission members commented on their concern with respect to setting precedence.
- ▮ The City Planner discussed an item to be raised under the miscellaneous portion of the regular session. Bill Petersen had requested the Planning Commission consider granting conditional use approval for two billboards near the frontage road and Glover Lane. One billboard already existed, but Mr. Petersen would like to enlarge that sign and build a second one about 500 feet to the south. There had been other uses for the property contemplated but denied by prior Planning Commissions.

## PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

**Present:** Chairman Kent Forsgren, Bart Hill, Cindy Roybal, Cory Ritz, Jim Talbot, Jordan White, Sid Young, City Planner David Petersen, and Deputy City Recorder Jeane Chipman

**Chairman Forsgren** called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. **Sid Young** offered the invocation.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**Jim Talbot** *MOVED* that the minutes of the March 13, 2003, Planning Commission Meeting be approved with corrections as noted. **Bart Hill** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

**PUBLIC HEARING: RAINEY HOMES, INC. REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL FOR THE PROPOSED TUSCANY COVE AT LAKE POINTE SUBDIVISION CONSISTING OF 25 LOTS AND 2 PARCELS ALL ON 15.156 ACRES LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1700 SOUTH (LUND LANE) AND 300 EAST IN AN S (SUBURBAN) ZONE (S-3-99) (Agenda Item #2)**

**Background Information:**

The Planning Commission granted preliminary plat approval for this subdivision on August 9, 2001. The previous developer lost his option to buy the property and subsequently the preliminary plat approval expired. Now the property owners want to revive the project and have contracted with a new developer.

The first three conditions outlined in the motion refer to an existing dirt road leading in a northeasterly direction away from the project site. A property owner east of the project (Brent Armstrong) in 2001 contended that this was a public highway and had served as access to his property. Upon further review of the matter, and after consulting with the Farmington City Attorney, the previous Planning Commission found that a public highway access had not been established but even if one had, the developer had to agree to provide an equal or superior access through another portion of the property. If the Planning Commission desires to grant preliminary plat approval to the present applicant, it is recommended that the Commission establish the same finding.

In order to develop the proposed Tuscany Cove project, the applicant must provide four major off-site improvements.

1. A water line to provide culinary water from the reservoir north of the subdivision to ensure adequate water pressure and fire protection flow capacity.
2. Off-site storm water improvements including a storm drain pipe south down Lund Lane and easterly along 200 East to an existing culvert, and an off-site easement over and across a ditch to convey storm water runoff to the general vicinity of the Lagoon billboard. The City's Storm Water Master Plan calls for a region-wide detention basin in this area.
3. The developer must improve Lund Lane from 200 East up to the western boundary of the project, and he must also develop a small segment of Park Hills Drive near the eastern boundary of the project altogether to provide adequate access for the subdivision.
4. The developer is not setting aside enough open space on site to meet the City's Conservation Subdivision requirements. Therefore, it is proposed that the developer provide an off-site trail easement as described in the suggested motion.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**David Petersen** reviewed the background information. Because the development was along the southern foothills and was at the southern most boundary of the City, it was problematic. Water lines and road access were two of the most difficult issues. Preliminary plat approval for the subdivision had been granted in 2001 but had expired. The land owner had found a new developer and wanted to move the project forward. Several issues remained to be resolved including, but not limited to, bringing a water line to the property, providing two road accesses to avoid the 1000 foot dead end street limitation, providing off-site trail easements to mitigate the insufficiency of open space in the subdivision, ensuring proper building pads because of the slope impact on some lots, implementing off-site storm drain improvements, and working with Centerville City with regards to trail head facilities, drainage and access. Mr. Petersen stated that Farmington City and Centerville City had tentatively negotiated the boundary in the area and that Lund Lane would be owned and maintained by Farmington, and the trail head and access to the new subdivision would be owned and maintained by Centerville. Centerville is creating a park directly south of the proposed subdivision and may receive all park impact fees from the Tuscany Cove.

### **Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

**Bart Longson** (representative of the developer) stated he had spoken with Centerville City officials about the possibility of having storm water run off handled in the retention basin to be located in their park. However, the developer is prepared to drain the storm water run off down Lund Lane if the detention basin is not an option. Mr. Longson stated that the building pads for each lot had been designed to meet City standards. When asked, Mr. Longson stated that the subdivision sloped to the southwest, which would be the natural flow of run off.

**Ms. McBrown** (owner of one of the lots to the west and adjacent to the proposed subdivision) expressed strong opposition to the development. She was very unhappy that she had recently purchased her property with the understanding that none of the property to the east would be developed for at least 10 years. Ms. McBrown felt strongly that Utah was being overdeveloped and was losing precious open space. With the construction of homes to the east of her land she would lose access to the foothills. Wildlife habitat would be lost and she would lose the reasons for which she purchased the lot. She said she would not have purchased the land if she had known that the subdivision was going in. She will not be able to enjoy nature as she can now. Ms. McBrown also stated she had been told that all the surrounding property from the mountains all the way to I-15 was zoned agriculture and could not understand how a subdivision could be allowed in that zoning area. She had planned to purchase horses to keep on her property and felt that would be threatened with the construction of the subdivision.

**Mr. Petersen** stated that the upper shelf of her lot was zoned agriculture and that it would likely be a very long time before it could be developed. Not all of the surrounding property was zoned A.

**Bret Frodsham** (property owner west of the subdivision, on the southern boundary of the City) stated that his family had owned their property for 45 years. Their land had been developed into horse property and he had great concerns about being able to maintain it as such. Usually, when large, expensive homes are built near horse property, the owners complain about the smells and noises of large animals and the horse property is threatened. He also had concerns about the density of development in the narrow strip of land between the mountains and the lake. He stated he knew of three fault lines, wetlands, and other concerns in the area.

**Mr. Petersen** reported that the developer had designed the subdivision with fewer lots than allowed by ordinance. He noted that the Frodshams owned property needed for access to the proposed development.

**Ryan Reed** (property owner to the west) expressed his concern about the lose of horse property and open space. He felt there would be problems caused on his property due to the storm water run off from the subdivision and stated there was already standing water on his property during rain storms. He was opposed to the development.

[Cory Ritz arrived at 7:40 P.M.]

**Terry Glover** (nearby property owner) was worried about storm drainage. Since his property was in a hallow to the west, he felt the run off would collect on his property and hamper any development he would like to do. He was also concerned about access to the north for future construction. He felt the road design should be further discussed with all property owners involved.

**Mr. Petersen** stated the design of the subdivision, which ended on the north in a cul-de-sac, had been done so because of the excessive slopes at that point. If a road were to continue north from Tuscany Cove it would have to be taken through an area where large cuts and fills would be needed and where no other development could take place. Access to developable property farther north of the subdivision could be achieved by other means.

**Jonathan Hughes** (927 South Mountainside Circle) said he had been required to stub a road going south from his subdivision. He questioned why there had not been a master plan to connect the two subdivisions. He thought his stubbed road would eventually go through to Lund Lane.

**Brent Armstrong** (Pretty Valley) stated there was an existing utility road that had been an historic access to the bench. It was used at least once a year and so had been established as public access. He feared it would be permanently cut off. He said that the access was needed occasionally for heavy equipment to get to his property.

**Mr. Petersen** explained that the developer was being required to provide an access equal to the current road.

**Mr. Glover** asked who owned the historic road and who would be required to maintain it.

**Mr. Petersen** stated the road referred to is not an easement of the Bureau of Reclamation

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing and asked for consideration by the Planning Commission. The Commission discussed the agenda item, including the following points:

- ↯ The proposed subdivision access road currently owned by the Frodshams was discussed. After conferring with the Frodshams, it was evident that negotiations could be conducted and that access could be arranged. Frank Frodsham felt the development was acceptable to him and that many of the hillside homes would not be visible.
- ↯ A great deal of work had already been done on the subdivision design. The development had been in process for several years.
- ↯ Several Commission Members felt that Centerville City should be contacted to negotiate drainage. Centerville City may be given park impact fees from the subdivision. It would be helpful if they would also allow storm drainage from at least part of the small subdivision to be handled on the park property to the south.
- ↯ One of the purposes of preliminary plat review is to gain input and minimize changes required of the developer at a later point.
- ↯ Protection of horse property in the area was discussed. Mr. Frodsham stated his willingness to negotiate with the developer in exchange for certain concessions. He did want to protect the rights of property owners in the area to own large animals, and he said there was a discrepancy regarding ownership of part of his land. He thought that perhaps part of his home may be on City-owned property. He wanted to be able to resolve that issue.
- ↯ The utility access road to the east was discussed. Mr. Armstrong stated the access was a public way and had been so for at least 20 years. It was the legal right of the public to use that access. Mr. Petersen reported that another situation in the City showed that prescriptive rights must be declared by a court and that obtaining the level of proof required was a difficult and long process. The developer was willing to provide an equal alternative to the utility road. Thus far, the City engineer felt the access being provided by the developer would meet requirement.

### **Motion**

**Bart Hill** moved that the Planning Commission grant preliminary plat approval for the Tuscany Cove at Lakepoint Subdivision located at approximately 1700 South (Lund Lane) and 300 East subject to all Farmington City development standards and applicable ordinances and the following conditions:

1. Developer shall construct a dirt road on its property that is at least as accessible as the current dirt road which traverses portions of Lots 21 through 25 of the proposed Tuscany Cove development and heads generally in a northeastern direction. The new road must not be of greater grade and slope at any point on said road than the current dirt road running through the property and the new road must be of a least equal width to the current dirt road.
2. The developer shall pay all expenses related to the construction of the road including preliminary engineering plans which must be approved by the Farmington City Engineer prior to the commencement of construction of the new road.
3. Upon completion of the new road and upon it being inspected by the Farmington City Engineer, the City will not object to the old road being revegetated and final plat approval from the City must be obtained for Tuscany Cove without showing the old road as an encumbrance on Lots 21 through 25.
4. The final plat will not be accepted by the City until the new road has been constructed by the developer and has passed inspection of the Farmington City Engineer.
5. Review and approval of final improvement drawings including a grading and drainage plan by the city Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Department, FAPID, Central Davis County Sewer District, and/or South Davis County Sewer District and UDOT. Given recent experiences with flooding resulting from a severe rain storm in the City on July 9, 2001, the Planning Commission directs the City Engineer to carefully review the drainage system plans prior to approval.
6. The developer shall obtain off-site trail easements for the owner of the property just east of the Tuscany Cove development. The easement shall go over and across the existing dirt road or trail leading from the proposed trailhead site in a northeasterly direction to the boundary of said property. Another trail easement accessible to the City shall be established along the Weber Basin aqueduct road from the north boundary line of said property to the Centerville City boundary.
7. Off-site water easements acceptable to the City to the new reservoir shall be obtained by developer. Moreover, the developer shall construct and extend from the subdivision to the reservoir a 10 inch water line to provide adequate fire flow capacity and water service to the Tuscany Cove project.

8. The applicant shall obtain off-site storm water easements acceptable to the City running west from 200 East to the general vicinity of the Lagoon billboard near 1470 South and the frontage road.
9. The applicant shall follow the City Engineer's recommendation in implementing the AGECE soils report.
10. The applicant shall resolve the remnant parcel issue regarding a narrow strip of land located in the southwest area of the subdivision prior to final plat approval by the Planning Commission.
11. The final configuration of Lot 1 of the Tuscan Cove Subdivision as subject to the layout (including input from the developer) of the joint Farmington/Centerville trailhead facility located adjacent to this lot.
12. The road cross section must have sidewalks on both sides of the street.
13. The developer shall enter into a Development Agreement with the City regarding the project prior to or concurrent with final plat approval.

**Sid Young** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, **Jim Talbot**, **Sid Young**, and **Chairman Forsgren** suggested amendments as follows:

14. Because Centerville is receiving an additional access to their proposed park and because they may receive park impact fees from Tuscan Cove, it is strongly recommended that Centerville be asked to receive the storm drain run off in the detention basin on the park property for at least a portion of the subdivision.
15. An agreement shall be reached with Centerville City regarding the 78 foot long right-of-way access to the subdivision.
16. Access through the Frodsham property shall be resolved by written agreement.
17. Approval shall be subject to Planning Commission review of grading and drainage plans for the northern lots.

Both Mr. Hill and Mr. Young concurred with the amendments.

A vote on the motion resulted in unanimous approval.

### **Findings**

7. A great deal of work had been accomplished in designing the subdivision in the

past several years. Developers had worked to meet requirements set by the Planning Commission.

- The main property owner impacted by the subdivision was in favor of the design.
- The subdivision will not destroy the vista of the mountains to the east.
- The rights of the large animals owners will be protected.
- The development met ordinance requirements.
- The development was consistent with the Master Plan.
- The density of the subdivision was lower than allowed. Centerville developments to the south are higher density.
- Public highway access had not been established through the property, but even if one had, the developer had to agree to provide an equal or superior access through another portion of the property.

**DAVID WEBSTER REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO DEVELOP A FLAG LOT LOCATED AT 717 SOUTH 200 WEST IN AN AE ZONE (S-3-03) (Agenda Item #3)**

**Background Information**

The Planning Commission tabled this agenda item on March 13, 2003, in order to allow time for City staff to gather information regarding other flag lot approvals and research schematic possibilities for the property to the east and to propose alternative development designs for the lot. This information is not included in the packet, but will be presented at the Planning Commission meeting.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**David Petersen** distributed a letter from Paul Radcliffe (owner of property directly south of the Webster property) which indicated strong concern regarding the flag lot request. Mr. Radcliffe informed Mr. Petersen that he disputed the boundary line between the two properties and that he would require a steel reinforced solid block wall the full length of the joint property line at that expense of Mr. Webster, otherwise he would adamantly oppose the flag lot. Mr. Petersen told Mr. Radcliffe that the boundary line and the fencing issues were civil matters and the City would not become involved.

Mr. Petersen reviewed the history of the application, reminding the Planning Commission they had tabled the agenda item to allow time for the City Planner to research other flag lot approvals and other development options. Mr. Petersen contacted Symphony Homes (a



developer with possible options on land east of Websters owned by Rawl Rice) to ask regarding schematic plans for the property. Symphony Homes said they did not own the property but stated that a property owner would lose building lots and thus property value if one caused a road to bend through a future subdivision to give access to the Webster's eastern property line. Such a property owner may need compensation for that loss.

Regarding flag lot development along the frontage road, Mr. Petersen reviewed six neighboring lots. Most, if not all, could request flag lot development because they met set back requirements. If the Websters were granted permission to subdivide into a flag lot, precedence would be set.

The City Planner stated that access from 200 East to the frontage road had been studied as a part of the City's Master Transportation Plan and that it was necessary for several roads to eventually be constructed between the two arteries for commuter traffic. One such road was 620 South (already improved), another was proposed through Rawl Rice's property approximately between 750 South and 800 South. If that road were to be improved, it may be possible to gain access to the north and create a cul-de-sac through the frontage road properties, allowing all those property owners to subdivide with several, non-flag lot properties. Doing so would not compromise property value or City ordinances. Such a development would likely be beneficial to all interested parties.

Mr. Petersen reported on flag lot approvals in the City over the past several months. He did not attempt to do an exhaustive report of flag lots in the City, however, he did look at some instances where flag lots had been created. In one case, a flag lot was approved to protect a historic home and potential for another access was eminent, eliminating the need for the stem. One flag lot was requested by the City to reduce curb cuts on a high traffic road. A flag lot was also approved in a case where the Sewer District would have had to install pumps for two homes located downhill from the sewer lines. The Sewer District required the design change.

**Chairman Forsgren** stated the agenda item was not a public hearing and asked the Commission members for their consideration.

**Jordan White** commented that he was in favor of the cul-de-sac design and asked how the idea could be encouraged.

**Mr. Petersen** stated that the 4 property owners involved would probably benefit from the design and that they would all have to agree.

Commission members discussed the issues, including the following points:

- ▮ The City Council and the Planning Commission had both made concerted efforts not to approve flag lots in the City.
- ▮ The possibility of creating a cul-de-sac on the eastern part of the frontage road lots was a potential windfall for those property owners and should be encouraged.

- ↯ The applicant could still apply for flag lot permission to the City Council if he wished to do so.
- ↯ The validity of the request for flag lot approval in this case was questionable.

### **Motion**

**Cory Ritz** moved that the Planning Commission deny Mr. Webster's request for a recommendation to the City Council to develop a flag lot located at 717 South 200 West. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

### **Findings**

- ↯ Reasons for the consistent effort by City officials to deny flag lot development included negative impact on surrounding property owners and public safety issues.
- ↯ The number of flag lots shall not exceed 10% of the total lots in the subdivision unless it is determined by the City that the property could not reasonably be developed otherwise, and, in this case, there existed a much better development option for the property. The cul-de-sac option would also benefit neighboring properties.
- ↯ The approval of a flag lot would set a precedence for all the lots along the frontage road.
- ↯ Property to the east of the Webster lot is developable.
- ↯ There does not exist unusual parcel dimension, configuration, or topographic conditions which would make traditional lot design not feasible.

### **PUBLIC HEARING: SMITH FOOD & DRUG/GOLDEN WEST ADVERTISING INC. REQUEST FOR CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL TO RELOCATE THE EXISTING SMITH'S SIGN APPROXIMATELY 30 FEET EAST OF THE PRESENT SIGN LOCATION (C-5-03) (Agenda Item #4)**

### **Background Information**

Smith's must move their sign now located in the northwest corner of their property due to the expansion of the U.S. 89 Highway corridor now underway. Presumably the sign received conditional use approval along with the rest of the Foxglove commercial center project in the mid 1980's. Section 11-8-106 of the Zoning Ordinance states:

“Once granted a conditional use shall not be enlarged, changed, extended, increased in intensity or relocated unless a new conditional use application is made and approved by the Planning Commission.”

As demonstrated on the site plan for the new sign location, it does not appear that the pole for the sign will block or impede the clear vision triangle required at intersections. Section 11-28-150 of the Zoning Ordinance states:

“In all zones with a required front yard, no material obstruction to view between a height of two (2) feet and ten (10) feet above the level of curb shall be permitted on any corner lot within a triangular area formed by the street property lines and a line connecting them between points thirty (30) feet from the intersection of the two street property lines.”

What is the height and the area of the ground sign? Section 15-5-030(4) paragraphs (d) (e) states:

“The area of a ground sign shall not exceed one square foot of area for each lineal foot of street frontage or 200 square feet whichever is less. This standard may be reviewed by the Planning Commission in conjunction with the conditional use application and may be adjusted either up or down.

“The maximum height of ground signs at the minimum setback shall be twenty (20) feet above the elevation of the top of curb nearest to the ground sign. This height may be increased to a maximum of 40 feet if the sign is set back an additional 1 ½ feet for each foot of height over twenty (20) feet. These standards may be reviewed by the Planning Commission in conjunction with the conditional use application and may be adjusted either up or down.”

It appears that the area of the ground sign does not exceed 200 square feet. The site plan provided by the applicant shows that the right-of-way line is just a few feet one or two feet west of the proposed location of the sign. However, parking spaces in the Smith’s parking lot are located well beyond this line. Does this mean that portions of the Smith’s parking lot will be located in the U.S. 89 right-of-way? This important information is necessary because it appears that the sign is between 30 and 40 feet high, and the Planning Commission has authority to adjust set back requirements if indeed the right-of-way line is in the location shown on the site plan.

Furthermore, Section 15-5-030(4)(f) states that on corner lots “Ground signs shall be set back thirty (30) feet from the intersection or property lines.” If the property line is the western edge of the parking lot, the new location of the site is 30 feet from the intersection. But, if the property line is further east than this, then the sign probably does not comply with this 30-foot set back standard.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** stated he had gathered more information regarding the application since the

packet had been prepared. Further information indicated that the sign would be placed well within set back requirements of City ordinances. The application met all City standards for signs. He recommended approval.

### **Public Hearing**

**Chairman Forsgren** opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

**Bob Moore** (representing Smith's Food and Drug and Golden West Advertising, Inc.) stated the sign will remain the same size and be replaced at the current height. He was available for any questions from the Planning Commission.

### **Public Hearing Closed**

With no further comments, **Chairman Forsgren** closed the public hearing and asked for consideration by the Planning Commission.

### **Motion**

After a brief discussion, **Sid Young** moved that the Planning Commission approve the application for conditional use and site plan approval to relocate the existing Smith's sign as requested. **Jordan White** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, by consensus, the Planning Commission members felt the current height and size of the sign was acceptable. A vote was taken indicating unanimous approval of the motion.

### **Findings**

- ⌞ The request met all City ordinances.
- ⌞ The public hearing resulted in no public opposition.
- ⌞ The motion was consistent with previous Planning Commission action.
- ⌞ The motion accommodates an important business in Farmington.

### **PUBLIC HEARING: HHI CORPORATION REQUEST FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO AMEND THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO ALLOW "SMALL AUTO DEALERSHIPS" AS A CONDITIONAL USE IN THE BR ZONE (Agenda Item #5)**

### **Background Information**

This item was reviewed at length at the March 13, 2003, Planning Commission meeting.

The Planning Commission tabled the request to allow property owners within 500 feet to be notified of the request. The Commission further approved a motion directing the City Planner to research options for either a temporary use or a special exception and to review these options with the City Attorney and discuss them with the applicant.

Regrading the special exception concept, the City Attorney recommends that the City not pursue this idea because State law stipulates that special exceptions cannot be granted for uses, only for physical and non-use limitations related to a subject property or site. For example, special exceptions may be considered for building heights, set backs, parking spaces, etc., but not for land use.

The City Attorney further recommends against sending a notice to specific property owners for a zone text change. If this type of notice is not required and if citizens become accustomed to receiving such a notice, then the City may have problems if notices are not sent in the future for similar situations.

Section 11-28-120(h)(2) limits the type of temporary uses allowed in commercial and industrial zones. Small auto dealership uses are not one of the uses enumerated in this section.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

**Mr. Petersen** reviewed the opinion of the City Attorney that neither the temporary permit nor the special exception would be appropriate for this request. Discussion by the Planning Commission included the following points:

- ¬ Commission members wanted to be supportive of HHI but the request did not seem in compliance with the Downtown Master Plan.
- ¬ If the request was granted it would set precedence for other businesses to do the same. Doing so would drastically impact the historical nature of the downtown area.
- ¬ Even if the Master Plan allowed the auto dealership, the area was not conducive to a successful auto business.

### **Motion**

**Jordan White** moved that the Planning Commission deny HHI Corporation's request for recommendation to the City Council to amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow "small auto dealerships" as a conditional use in the BR zone. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion.

In discussion of the motion, the Planning Commission stated they felt a need to protect the sensitive nature of the historic downtown area. A vote was taken which was unanimous in favor of the motion.

## **Findings**

- ↯ The request did not fit with the Downtown Master Plan.
- ↯ Approval of the request would set a precedence for other similar businesses to open in the downtown area.
- ↯ The historic nature of the downtown area needed to be protected.
- ↯ Recommendations of the City Attorney were being followed.

## **CITY COUNCIL REPORT AND MISCELLANEOUS**

### **Discussion Item/Billboard Along the Frontage Road**

**Mr. Petersen** stated that Bill Petersen had approached the Planning Commission asking for their input regarding a possible request to construct two 14' x 40' bill boards along the frontage road near Glover Lane on property which he owns. The Planning Commission discussed the issue, including the following points:

- ↯ The property is zoned commercial, which allows billboards if approved as a conditional use and according to specific requirements.
- ↯ The billboards requested would exceed the size requirement of City ordinance.
- ↯ The billboards would impact the rural feeling of the area.
- ↯ The billboards would be constructed 40 feet high, which met with some hesitancy by the Planning Commission. The height of the signs would restrict mountain vistas.
- ↯ Burke Lane will be a highly commercial area which will be displacing open space and rural atmosphere from the City. It may be that other areas should be sheltered from those kinds of uses.
- ↯ Commission members felt they needed more information. They asked that nearby communities be surveyed to see how many signs they have, how large they are, and what other restrictions had been set.
- ↯ Some Commission members felt it was nice to have Farmington free of billboards.

- ¬ Commission members discussed whether or not there would be more value in the use of the property without the billboards. However, Mr. Petersen stated the billboard brings in a surprising amount of revenues for him personally.
- ¬ Commission members felt it would be wise to revisit the ordinances to be sure they addressed billboards in an appropriate and helpful manner.

### **City Council Report**

- ¬ The City Council approved the Planning Commission recommendation to realign boundary lines in Shepard Heights Subdivision to accommodate an equestrian/pedestrian trail subject to plat recordation within a set time period.
- ¬ The City Council held a public open house regarding future land use along I-15 and U.S. Highway 89 to which the Planning Commission was invited.
- ¬ The City Council amended the R-2 Zoning provision to allow “Secondary Dwellings” as a conditional use.
- ¬ The Miller Meadows Schematic Plan was favorably approved.
- ¬ The footings of a home in the Farmington Creek Estates that were placed too deep caused consideration of an amendment to the development agreement. However, the City Council denied the request and found that the global soils report needed to be followed.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Sid Young** *MOVED* to adjourn at 9:40 P.M.

---

*Kent Forsgren, Chairman*  
*Farmington City Planning Commission*